## **REMARKS**

By this Amendment claims 1-20 have been amended to better comply with U.S. practice. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action the examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buchalla et al., he has rejected claims 1-3, 11, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Karazivan et al., he has rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karazivan et al., and he has rejected claims 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karazivan et al.

These rejections are incorrect!

Buchalla et al. disclose a method and apparatus for detecting dental caries during treatment, the apparatus including a handpiece which has an integral drill head and an integral light source to cause tooth luminescence. However, there is no disclosure of a means for mixing colored light to a spotlight cone (the means of Buchalla et al. are operated alternatively).

Karazivan et al. disclose a dental tartar detection and removal device which includes a powered tartar removal instrument 12, an illumination means 14, a detection means 16, and an analyzing system. There is no disclosure of a means for mixing colored light to a spotlight cone.

Serial No. 10/588,653 Amendment dated April 3, 2009 Reply to OA of Dec. 3, 2008

No combination of Buchalla et al. and Karazivan et al. would suggest the applicant's claimed apparatus or method.

. The presented claims should be allowed.

\* 4 ". . . .

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:

Richard H. Tushin

Registration No. 27,297

Franklin Square, Third Floor West

1300 I Street N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-3353

(202) 906-8680